

**Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary**

Application No.

10/017,893

Applicant(s)

CADIENTE ET AL.

Examiner

Harry A. Grosso

Art Unit

3727

**All Participants:**(1) Harry A. Grosso.(2) Mr. Francis Kalinski.**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 27 March 2006Time: 1:00PM**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*Obviousness-type double patenting.*

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet***Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Kalinski was advised that this application is subject to an obviousness-type double patenting rejection over the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,962,263. Although the claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the patented claims show all the structure of the device. A terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321 was needed to overcome the double patenting rejection.